



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,755	04/30/2001	D. Amnon Silverstein	10992043-1	9186

7590 06/15/2004  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/843,755

Applicant(s)

SILVERSTEIN, D. AMNON

Examiner

Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 03/23/2004.
2. Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 10 are independent claims.

This action is made final.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Berteig (US 6,348,936).

As per independent claim 1, Berteig teaches a movable display comprising:

means for detecting movement of the movable display relative to a first surface; and  
means for correlating movement of the movable display to information representing a portion of a first image stored in a database, and for presenting the information on the movable display (col. 4, lines 6-34).

As per claims 2 and 3, which are dependent on claim 1 and 2 respectively, Berteig teaches the detecting means is a transducer included within the movable display wherein the transducer

Art Unit: 2174

is used to correlate movement of the movable display to a change in position on a stored image (fig. 4; col. 4, lines 6-34).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Berteig teaches the detecting means is configured to detect orientation of the movable display (up and down orientation in fig. 4).

As per claims 5 and 6, which are dependent on claims 1 and 5 respectively, Berteig the correlating means includes a processor (813 of fig. 8) and associated memory (815 of fig. 8) wherein the database is stored in a memory on board the movable display (812 of fig. 8).

As per claims 7 and 8, which are dependent on claims 5 and 7 respectively, Berteig teaches the information is stored in a database remote from the movable display wherein the information stored remote to the movable display is accessed via a wired link (col. 6, lines 27-51).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 7, Berteig teaches the information stored remote to the movable display is accessed via a wireless link (col. 6, line 22).

As per independent claim 10, it is a similar scope to claim 1; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, it is a similar scope to claim 4; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 10, it is a similar scope to claim 6; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 10, it is a similar scope to claim 7; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 10, it is a similar scope to claim 8; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 10, it is a similar scope to claim 9; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berteig in view of Cobbley et al. ("Cobbley", US 6,501,464).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 12, Berteig does not disclose the first image is an image of a keyboard that can be operated using the moveable display. Cobbley discloses the first image is an image of a keyboard that can be operated using the moveable display at col. 1, lines 8-30. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Cobbley of operating an image of a keyboard using the movable display in Berteig's system since it would allow the system using keyboard functionality without the need of a physical keyboard.

7. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berteig in view of Singh (US 6,359,615).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 10, Berteig does not disclose a first portion of the first image is displayed at a first resolution and a second portion of the first image is displayed with a reduced resolution relative to the first resolution. Singh discloses a portion of the first image is displayed at a first resolution (30 of fig. 6) and a second portion of the first image is displayed with a reduced resolution (42 of fig. 6) relative to the first resolution. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Singh of displaying a portion of the first image at a first resolution and a second portion of the first image with a reduced resolution relative to the first resolution in Berteig's system since it would increase the amount of information that can be displayed within a screen.

***Response to Arguments***

Art Unit: 2174

8. Applicant's arguments filed 03/23/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued the following:

The display of the Berteig patent is not described as being movable. Moreover, there is no movement of the movable display relative to a first surface.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

The Berteig reference still reads on the claim language of claims 1 and 10. Since “display” means “a presentation of something in open view”, “movable display” can be interpreted as a movable presentation. In fig. 4 (col. 4, lines 6-34), navigating between position A and B can make the display document (or presentation) movable by jumping back and forth between pages 3 and 7 relative to the display monitor screen (first surface). Therefore, Berteig does teach “means for detecting movement of the movable display relative to a first surface”.

### *Conclusion*

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2174

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Inquiries***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-8318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5:30 PM with every other Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen  
June 03, 2004

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100